

App. No. 10/046,135

Amendment Dated: November 17, 2004

Reply to Office Action of May 17, 2004

### REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Office Action mailed May 17, 2004 has been received and the Examiner's comments carefully reviewed. The Office Action rejected Claims 1-19 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a). Claims 1-19 are currently pending. Claims 1, 8 and 14 have been amended. No new matter has been added.

#### 35 U.S.C. 103(a) Rejections

The Office Action rejected Claims 1-19 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No. 6,262,724 issued to Crow et al. (hereinafter Crow) in view of Pub. No. US 20002/0124100 A1 of Adams (hereinafter Adams). Applicants respectfully disagree and present the following arguments for consideration.

The Office Action states that Crow shows "receiving a request for a rich media presentation from the device before the device requests to play a media package." Applicants respectfully disagree. Crow discloses a user interface for controlling processing of time-based media files (See Abstract). At column 2, lines 18-28, Crow discloses user interfaces, such as Laser Media Players, that include the ability to select chapters or sections of a media. Crow does NOT disclose "receiving a request for a rich media presentation from the device before the device requests to play a media package" as recited in Claim 1 (emphasis added). Laser media players only receive a request to play a media file when it is requested and not in advance.

Additionally, as amended, Claim 1 recites, in part "determining when the request for the rich media presentation comes from a supported site, and when the request comes from a

App. No. 10/046,135

Amendment Dated: November 17, 2004

Reply to Office Action of May 17, 2004

supported site; detecting attributes relating to the device; automatically generating the rich media presentation for the device, wherein the rich media presentation is optimized for the device based on the detected attributes." Crow and Adams, do not disclose, alone or in combination these teachings.

In response to Claim 8, the Office Action states on page 7 that Crow discloses "determining when the device is authorized to receive the rich media presentation" at col. 1, lines 55-64. Applicants respectfully disagree. The Applicants can not find in Crow where this determination occurs. Additionally, Claim 8, has been amended, and recites, in part "determining when the request for the rich media presentation comes from a supported site; determining when the device is authorized to receive the rich media presentation; and when: detecting attributes relating to the device; automatically generating the rich media presentation for the device when needed, wherein the rich media presentation is optimized based on the detected attributes relating to the device." The Applicants submit, that Crow and Adams, do not disclose, alone or in combination, these teachings.

Independent Claim 14 has been similarly amended.

For at least the reasons discussed above, the Applicants respectfully submit that independent Claims 1, 8 and 14 are not obvious in view of the cited references and are therefore allowable. Similarly, Claims 2-7, 9-13, and 15-19, which depend from valid base claims, are allowable for at least the same reasons

App. No. 10/046,135  
Amendment Dated: November 17, 2004  
Reply to Office Action of May 17, 2004

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, all pending claims are believed to be allowable and the application is in condition for allowance. Therefore, a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested. Should the Examiner have any further issues regarding this application, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney for the applicant at the telephone number provided below.

Respectfully submitted,

MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Timothy P. Sullivan

Registration No. 47,981

Direct Dial: 206.342.6254

MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.  
P. O. Box 2903  
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-0903  
206.342.6200

